

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 24-30, 33-36, 48-53, 58-60, 62 and 65 are currently pending
- Claim 65 is canceled herein
- Claims 24, 48, 58 and 62 are amended herein

[0003] Claims 24, 48, 58 and 62 are amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 65.

Specification Objections

[0004] The Specification stands objected to as allegedly not providing sufficient antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The specification is specifically objected to for allegedly lacking the necessary support for the terms “computer-readable media” and “computing device.” (See action page 3). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s objection. Both these terms are clearly supported in the specification at page 14, line 21 through page 15, line 10. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Cited Documents

[0005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Simonetti: Simonetti, U.S. Patent No. 5,295,261
- Boulton: Boulton et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,566,291
- Wang: Wang, U.S. Patent No. 5,539,922
- Eldridge: Eldridge et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,716

Claims 24-28, 30 and 62 Are Non-Obvious Over Simonetti in view of Boulton and in further view of Wang

[0006] Claims 24-28, 30 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Simonetti in view of Boulton and in further view of Wang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 24

[0007] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 24 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Simonetti, Boulton and Wang does not teach or suggest that “the at least one second hierarchical tree structures comprise a plurality of nodes, wherein each node is assigned an organization-specific proprietary identifier.” This element is clearly not taught or suggested by the cited art. This element has been incorporated from dependent claim

65. Additional support for this claim element can be found at least at pages 26 and 27 of the present application.

[0008] As the Examiner failed to address this claim element in the Office Action mailed May 06, 2009, Applicant make the assumption that the Examiner agrees that the cited references do not teach or suggest these additional elements and features. Consequently, the combination of Simonetti, Boulton and Wang does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 25-30 and 33-36

[0009] Claims 25-30 and 33-36 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 25-30 and 33-36 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 62

[0010] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 62 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Simonetti, Boulton and Wang does not teach or suggest that “the at least one second hierarchical tree structures comprise a plurality of nodes, wherein each node is assigned an organization-specific proprietary identifier.” This element is clearly not taught or suggested by the cited art. This element has been incorporated from dependent claim

65. Additional support for this claim element can be found at least at pages 26 and 27 of the present application.

[0011] As the Examiner failed to address the dependent claim 65 in the Office Action mailed May 06, 2009, Applicant make the assumption that the Examiner agrees that the cited references do not teach or suggest these additional elements and features. Consequently, the combination of Simonetti, Boulton and Wang does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Claims 48-49 and 58-60 Are Non-Obvious Over Simonetti in view of Wang

[0012] Claims 48-49 and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Simonetti in view of Wang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 48

[0013] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 48 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Simonetti and Wang does not teach or suggest “each node of the second hierarchical tree structure being assigned an organization-specific proprietary identifier.” This element is clearly not taught or suggested by the cited art. This element has been incorporated from dependent claim 65. Additional support for this claim element can be found at least at pages 26 and 27 of the present application.

[0014] As the Examiner failed to address this claim element in the Office Action mailed May 06, 2009, Applicant make the assumption that the Examiner agrees that the cited references do not teach or suggest these additional elements and features. Consequently, the combination of Simonetti and Wang does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 49-53

[0015] Claims 49-53 ultimately depend from independent claim 48. As discussed above, claim 48 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 49-53 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 58

[0016] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 58 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Simonetti and Wang does not teach or suggest that each individual node of the other tree structure comprises “an organization-specific proprietary identifier.” This element is clearly not taught or suggested by the cited art. This element has been incorporated from dependent claim 65. Additional support for this claim element can be found at least at pages 26 and 27 of the present application.

[0017] As the Examiner failed to address this claim element in the Office Action mailed May 06, 2009, Applicant make the assumption that the Examiner agrees that the

cited references do not teach or suggest these additional elements and features. Consequently, the combination of Simonetti and Wang does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 59-60

[0018] Claims 59-60 ultimately depend from independent claim 58. As discussed above, claim 58 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 59-60 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0019] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-07-01
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090